

CITY HALL
BOX CC
CARMEL-BY-THE-SEA, CALIFORNIA 93921

RECEIVED
FEB - 8 2000
SHERRI L. PEDERSEN
CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
DEPUTY

February 3, 2000

The Honorable John M. Phillips
Presiding Judge
Monterey County Superior Court
240 Church Street
Salinas, CA 93901

RE: 1999 Monterey County Grand Jury Final Report

Dear Judge Phillips:

Enclosed is the required response to the following section of the referenced Monterey County Grand Jury Report:

Methamphetamine

Prepared by Police Chief Donald P. Fuselier under the date of
3 January 2000.

The response was approved by the City County at the I February 2000 meeting. We trust that the material will satisfy the response requirements as set forth in State law.

Very truly yours,



Ken White
Mayor

DPF:dy

c: Members of the City Council
City Administrator
Assistant City Administrator
Chief of Police

**CITY OF CARMEL-BY-THE-SEA RESPONSE TO THE 1999 MONTEREY
COUNTY GRAND JURY FINAL REPORT (DECEMBER 31, 1999)**

METHAMPHETAMINE

FINDINGS

1. *A significant danger from waste by-products, related to both the manufacture and usage of methamphetamine, places the population-at-large in an at-risk situation. Major meth-makers frequently change the locations of their manufacturing operations making their discovery difficult for law enforcement.*

Response: The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea agrees with the finding.

2. *Monterey County is the unwitting host to large numbers of individuals involved in the clandestine manufacturing of meth. The profit incentive encourages many individuals to engage in the criminal practice of making of meth.*

Response: The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea agrees with the finding.

3. *The prevalence of meth-related criminal activities places the population-at-large at increased risk of such crimes as burglary, robbery, and assault.*

Response: The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea agrees with the finding.

4. *Monterey County is experiencing an increasing incidence of meth-usage and addiction among the population-at-large, especially among youths. Meth manufacturers have developed a multi-level (pyramid) sales scheme.*

Response: The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea agrees with the finding.

5. *The seizure of assets, including real property of individuals involved in meth-making, is often not being exercised by Monterey County law enforcement.*

Response: The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea has insufficient data to formulate a knowledgeable response to this statement.

Grand Jury
City Responses
1 February 2000
Page 2

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Law enforcement agencies approach the methamphetamine problem as a distinct entity not related to other drug enforcement activities.*

2. *Law enforcement agencies be required to submit information concerning all arrests relating to methamphetamine to the press in the form of press releases rather than simply indicating such incidents in the daily activities logs.*

3. *Law enforcement agencies develop a coordinated communications plan so that methamphetamine information can be effectively shared by all agencies.*

Response: The recommendations have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future. The time frame for implementation is dependent on the coordinating efforts of all Monterey County law enforcement agencies. The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea will support all efforts to accomplish these recommendations.

4. *The Monterey County Board of Supervisors (BOS) seek the means for funding special methamphetamine-abatement personnel and programs.*

5. *The BOS seek the means of funding environmental clean-up of legally seized, methamphetamine-related properties, and execute the resale of such properties as a means of funding increased anti-methamphetamine activities.*

6. *The BOS and City Councils provide funding for the purchase of a meth-trained canine.*

7. *The BOS and City Councils provide funding for the training and placement of more meth-qualified Deputies in the field.*

Response: The recommendations require further analysis as they are dependent on County funding. The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea cannot comment on any City funding of additional Sheriff's Office personnel or canine support until the costs and scope of those programs are developed and discussed. It is unclear whether the recommended programs can be fully developed within the six-month period specified in the Penal Code.